

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-33 are pending in the present application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-33. Applicant has added new claim 34. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of pending claims 1-34.

The Examiner has rejected claims 23, 24, 32, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, a being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In the advisory action, the Examiner states, "Examiner believes, given the broadest reasonable interpretation of claim limitations, that the rejections of claims 1-33 based on the teaching of Puntambekar et al.; Honda et al.; Yang et al.; and Smith et al. indicated in the final office action is proper," but does not discuss the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Thus, Applicant understands Applicant's response to the final Office action to have obviated the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 17, 22, 23, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Puntambekar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,097,726). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant notes that claims 1, 2, 6, and 7 recite a "multi-protocol switch, comprising...a switching fabric operably coupled to the plurality of line cards; and an ingress line card operably coupled to the switching fabric...." Applicant notes that the Examiner cites Figure 4 of Puntambekar et al. as disclosing such features. However, Applicant submits that the recited structure is not disclosed in Figure 4 of Puntambekar et al. Rather, Figure 4 of Puntambekar et al. depicts several switches S10, S11, S20, and S21. Thus, Applicant submits that Puntambekar et al. fails to disclose the claimed invention as recited in claims 1, 2, 6, and 7. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 1, 2, 6, and 7 are in condition for allowance.

Applicant reiterates Applicant's arguments as set forth in Applicant's response to the final Office action, both with respect to the above-referenced claims and with respect to the other pending claims. Therefore, Applicant submits the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Applicant has added new claim 34. Applicant submits new claim 34 is in condition for allowance.

In conclusion, Applicant has overcome all of the Office's rejections, and early notice of allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

02/09/2005

Date



Ross D. Snyder, Reg. No. 37,730

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Ross D. Snyder & Associates, Inc.

115 Wild Basin Road, Suite 107

Austin, Texas 78746

(512) 347-9223 (phone)

(512) 347-9224 (fax)